



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,677	04/18/2007	Ake Booze	HALBI 3.3-002	4999
530	7590	08/31/2010	EXAMINER	
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090				HINZE, LEO T
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2854				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/31/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/584,677	BOOSE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LEO T. HINZE	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 29-33 and 35-59 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 29-33,35-54 and 57-59 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 55, 56 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 21 June 2010, with respect to claims 55 and 56, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - a. Applicant argues on p. 16 that claims 55 and 56 have been rejected as being anticipated by Weeks. This appears to be a true factual statement. However, this statement is not persuasive in overcoming the rejection of claims 55 and 56.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 21 June 2010, with respect to claims 29-33, 35-54 and 57-59, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - a. However, while the arguments presented by Applicant are not persuasive, the amendments to claims 29, 40, 50, and 51 have patentably distinguished the claimed invention over the prior art. By amending the claims to further define the differences between the structure of the claimed invention and the prior art, Applicant has shown that the elongated slit of the claimed invention has a structure that is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the prior art.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 29-33, 35-54, and 57-59 are allowed.
4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:
 - a. Regarding claims 29, 40, and 50, the prior art of record does not teach or render obvious a doctor blade mounting system having all of the claimed structure and functionality, including a clamping portion of an elongated frame having an elongated

slit, a doctor blade disposed within said elongated slit with a clamping means for fixing said doctor blade within said elongated slit, said elongated slit presenting a contoured surface including an outer end having a first predetermined dimension corresponding to the entrance into said elongated slit, an intermediate portion having a second predetermined dimension, said second predetermined dimension being greater than said first predetermined dimension, and an inner portion having a third dimension, said third predetermined dimension being smaller than said first and second predetermined dimensions.

b. Regarding claim 51, the prior art of record does not teach or render obvious a method for removably clamping a doctor blade in a clamping member having all of the steps and structure as claimed, including a clamping portion of an elongated frame having an elongated slit, a doctor blade disposed within said elongated slit with a clamping means for fixing said doctor blade within said elongated slit, said elongated slit presenting a contoured surface including an outer end having a first predetermined dimension corresponding to the entrance into said elongated slit, an intermediate portion having a second predetermined dimension, said second predetermined dimension being greater than said first predetermined dimension, and an inner portion having a third dimension, said third predetermined dimension being smaller than said first and second predetermined dimensions.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 55 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weeks, US 5,152,221 A (hereafter Weeks).

a. Regarding claim 55, Weeks teaches a method for removably attaching a doctor blade clamping portion (19, Fig. 1) to a support having at least one end portion (18, Fig. 1), said doctor blade clamping portion including a first slit including a first opening (20, Fig. 1) and a second slit including a second opening (25, Fig. 1), said first slit having a first side and a second side and intended to accommodate said doctor blade (17, Fig. 1), and said second slit having a first side and a second side, said second side of said first slit presenting a substantially planar surface for one side of said doctor blade, whereby said doctor blade can be held along said substantially planar surface of said second side of said first slit (see arrangement of doctor blade in 19, Figs. 1, 2), said method comprising introducing said at least one end portion of said support (18, Fig. 1) into said second opening of said second slit and inserting resilient clamping means into

said second opening of said second slit for resiliently supporting said at least one end portion of said support within said clamping portion (32, Figs. 1, 2).

b. Regarding claim 56, Weeks teaches the method of claim 55, as discussed in the rejection of claim 55 above. Weeks also teaches wherein said second side of said second slit presents a substantially planar surface for one side of said support, whereby said support can be held along said substantially planar surface of said second side of said second slit (see arrangements of 18 in slit 25, Figs. 1 and 2).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leo T. Hinze whose telephone number is 571.272.2864. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on 571.272.2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leo T. Hinze
Patent Examiner
AU 2854
24 August 2010

/Judy Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2854